



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,110	07/25/2003	Harry Michael Schell	9400-31	3761

39072 7590 10/13/2005

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 37428  
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/627,110		SCHELL, HARRY MICHAEL	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries		2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/25/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-14, 16-17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Publication 2004/0001223 A1).

**As per claims 1 and 11**, Tanaka discloses a method of routing print files in a computer system including evaluating content of at least one print file (See Tanaka, Page 3, paragraph 0040), and selectively routing the print file based on the evaluated content of the print file (See Tanaka, Page 3, paragraph 0044). Tanaka does not disclose expressly that the evaluation is based on a routing policy; however, Tanaka does disclose that the routing is based on information derived from a distribution route service database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conclude that the information contained in the distribution route service database comprises a routing policy. The motivation for storing the routing policy information in a distribution route service database would be to allow for subsequent invoicing based on the content of the print order and the distribution route information (See Tanaka, Page 3, paragraph 0040). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to conclude that the information contained in the distribution route service database comprises a routing policy for the benefit of allowing for subsequent invoicing based on the content of the print order and the distribution route as stored in the distribution route service database to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 11.

**As per claims 2 and 12**, Tanaka discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Tanaka also discloses searching the content of the print file for one or more keywords that are defined by the routing policy (See Tanaka, Pages 3-4, paragraph 0045).

**As per claims 3 and 13**, Tanaka discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Tanaka also discloses comparing the content of the print file to one or more data structures that are defined by the routing policy (See Tanaka, Page 3, paragraph 0040).

**As per claims 4 and 14**, Tanaka discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Tanaka also discloses evaluating content based on setting files (See Tanaka, Page 3, paragraph 0040). Tanaka does not disclose expressly that the settings are contained in an INI file, however, it is well known in the art that an INI file contains system configuration or setting information (See definition of INI file, Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition, Page 273).

**As per claims 6 and 16**, Tanaka discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Tanaka also discloses making the print file accessible to devices on a computer network (See Tanaka, Page 3, paragraph 0044, and Figure 3, element 140).

**As per claims 7 and 17**, Tanaka discloses the limitations of claims 6 and 16 as described above. Tanaka also discloses posting the print file on a Web page (See Tanaka, Page 3, paragraph 0042, and Figure 7).

**As per claims 9 and 19**, Tanaka discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Tanaka also discloses transferring information from the print file to another file.(See Tanaka, page 4, paragraph 0056).

**As per claims 10 and 20**, Tanaka discloses the limitations of claims 9 and 19 as described above. Tanaka also discloses transferring information from the print file to known fields in a report that are defined by the routing policy (See Tanaka, Pages 3-4, paragraph 0045).

2. Claims 5, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Publication 2004/0001223 A1) as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Luo ("Content Management on Server Farm with Layer-7 Routing").

**As per claim 21**, Tanaka discloses a method of routing print files in a computer system including searching content of a print file to identify one or more keywords (See Tanaka, Pages 3-4, paragraph 0045). Tanaka does not disclose expressly that the evaluation is based on a routing policy; however, Tanaka does disclose that the routing is based on information derived from a distribution route service database. It would

Art Unit: 2176

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conclude that the information contained in the distribution route service database comprises a routing policy. The motivation for storing the routing policy information in a distribution route service database would be to allow for subsequent invoicing based on the content of the print order and the distribution route information (See Tanaka, Page 3, paragraph 0040). Therefore, it would have been obvious to conclude that the information contained in the distribution route service database comprises a routing policy for the benefit of allowing for subsequent invoicing based on the content of the print order and the distribution route as stored in the distribution route service database to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21. Tanaka also does not disclose expressly renaming the print file. Luo discloses renaming a file to support content-based routing (See Luo, Page 1137, Column 2, Section 4.2, paragraph 1). Tanaka and Luo are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of routing electronic information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the renaming of a file of Luo with the method of Tanaka. The motivation for doing so would have been to convert the original name of the file into a fixed length and formatted name (See Luo, Page 1137, Column 2, Section 4.3, paragraph 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Luo with Tanaka for the benefit of converting the original name of the file into a fixed length and formatted name to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

**Claims 5 and 15** are rejected on the same basis as claim 21.

3. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Publication 2004/0001223 A1) as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Digate (U.S. Publication 2004/0161080 A1).

**As per claims 8 and 18**, Tanaka discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Tanaka does not disclose expressly emailing the file to one or more users on a computer network based on the content of the print file and the routing policy. Digate discloses a rules based messaging system including emailing data based on various defined rules (See Digate, Page 1, paragraph 0012). Tanaka and Digate are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of distributing electronic information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the emailing of data of Digate with the routing policy of Tanaka. The motivation for doing so would have been to control the distribution of the data (See Digate, Page 1, paragraph 0013). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Digate with Tanaka for the benefit of controlling the distribution of data to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 18.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- West Jr (U.S. Patent 6,835,477 B1) discloses a method and system for routing messages in a communications network.
- Bankert (U.S. Publication 2002/0123999 A1) discloses query service for electronic documents archived in a multi-dimensional storage space.
- Delgato (U.S. Publication 2002/0052873 A1) discloses a system and method for obtaining user preference and providing user recommendations for unseen physical and information goods and services.
- Xu discloses database selection techniques for routing bibliographic queries.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more



Art Unit: 2176

information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

*William L. Bashore*  
WILLIAM BASHORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
11/11/2005